

The above amendment presents a new set of claims in which new claim 22 is based on previous claim 13, new claim 23 is based on previous claim 3, new claim 24 is based on previous claim 14, new claim 25 is based on previous claim 15, new claim 26 is based on previous claim 21, and new claim 27 is based on previous claim 17.

The new claims essentially make the previous claims consistent with each other, and provide antecedent basis for all terminology.

In the Official Action of January 10, 1995, it was indicated that Examples 1 to 3 are enabling, but that Examples 4 to 7 were not enabling.

As explained at the interview, this is not the case for reasons set forth below.

In fact, the structure of each Example is the same. Each Example takes the form of a protocol. Examples 1 to 3 additionally contain some indication of result; Examples 4 to 7 do not.

But Example 4 comprises three steps:

i) precipitation of bacteriophage as in Example 3;

ii) a standard lysis/extraction step not employing beads; and

iii) precipitation of DNA as in Example 1.

Example 5 is similar to Example 4 except for the lysis/extraction step ii).

Hence, Examples 4 and 5 are as much enabled as Examples 1 to 3.

For the foregoing reasons, taken with those set forth in the response of June 12, 1995, it is considered that all rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone or facsimile number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. REEVE

By Matthew Jacob
Matthew Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicant

MJ/acr
Washington, D.C.
Telephone (202) 371-8850
Facsimile (202) 371-8856
June 22, 1995